To appear in *Molecular Physics*
Vol. 00, No. 00, Month 200x, 1–24

arXiv:1612.08182v1 [quant-ph] 24 Dec 2016

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Time-dependent local-to-normal mode transition in triatomic molecules

Hans Cruz[a]*, Marisol Bermúdez-Montaña [a], Renato Lemus[a]

[b]*Instituto de Ciencias Nucleares, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, A. P. 70543, México, DF 04510, México.*

(*v4.5 released September 2009*)

Time-evolution of the vibrational states of two interacting harmonic oscillators in the local mode scheme is presented. A local-to-normal mode transition (LNT) is identified and studied from the time dependent point of view. The LNT is established as a polyad breaking phenomenon from the local point of view for the stretching degrees of freedom in a triatomic molecule. This study is carried out in the algebraic representation of bosonic operators. The dynamics of the states are determined via the solutions of the corresponding nonlinear Ermakov equation. Application of this formalism to H_2O, CO_2, O_3 and NO_2 molecules in the adiabatic, sudden and linear regime is considered.

Keywords:
Ermakov system, vibrational excitations, time-dependent Schrödinger equation, local-to-normal mode transition, polyad breaking.

1. Introduction

For a long time the normal mode picture (NM) to describe the molecular vibrational degrees of freedom was the unique fundamental tool to interpret infrared and Raman spectra [1]. In this theoretical framework the system is described as a set of harmonic oscillators, whose non diagonal interactions give rise to the concept of normal polyad $\hat{P}_N$, a pseudo quantum number encompassing subsets of interacting states determined by the most relevant resonances [2]. The normal mode analysis is conveniently treated in an algebraic manner through the introduction of bosonic operators [3–5].

As the spectroscopic techniques become more refined [6–10] highly excited states near the chemical "significant" region were detected, showing unexpected regularities (energy doublets) from the point of view of the NM picture without resonances. This pattern however was well understood considering a local mode model, which describes the molecular system in terms of a set of interacting local oscillators, typically associated with the stretching bonds involving large mass differences of type X-H, for instance [11–18]. Abundant literature emerged concerned with this description as well as with the connection with the traditional description in terms of normal modes [19–27].

The physical foundation behind the local mode description of a molecular system is the appearance of bonds involving large mass differences, which leads to the

*Corresponding author. Email: hans@ciencias.unam.mx

ISSN: 0040-5167 print/ISSN 1754-2278 online
© 200x Taylor & Francis
DOI: 10.1080/0040516YYxxxxxxxx
http://www.informaworld.com

possibility of considering the vibrational description as a set of independent local oscillators at zeroth order, a natural description when both kinetic and potential energies are expanded in terms of local coordinates [28]. This approach simplifies the vibrational description allowing simple models to be applied. This contrasts to variational methods where the kinetic energy is calculated in exact form although computationally expensive.

The suitability for applying a local model may be pondered by the splitting between the fundamentals associated with an equivalent set of vibrational degrees of freedom. It is expected a small splitting relative to the fundamental energies to identify local behaviour. A remarkable feature of a local mode behaviour is that a local polyad $\hat{P}_{\mathrm{L}}$ can be identified in terms local number operators besides the normal polyad $\hat{P}_{\mathrm{N}}$. Due to the interaction between the oscillators and anharmonicity a splitting among the levels associated with a given polyad is present. This splitting is a measure of the locality degree [15, 16]. This local polyad preserving feature characterizes the local mode behaviour. As the interaction increases the levels associated with different polyads approach and $\hat{P}_{\mathrm{L}}$ stop being preserved. This interaction enhancement may be interpreted either as a geometry and/or masses ratio changes. In this situation $\hat{P}_{\mathrm{L}}$ is broken and the normal mode description with well defined polyad $\hat{P}_{\mathrm{N}}$ should be preferred. This phenomenon is manifested as a transition process of polyad breaking but also by the impossibility of a reasonable estimation of the force constants starting from a local scheme [29]. This local-to-normal mode transition (LNT) has been studied taking the parametric transition from H_2O and CO_2 molecule [30]. The local polyad breaking has been detected using several concepts: probability density, fidelity, entropy and Poincaré sections. This polyad breaking can be identified by considering two local interacting harmonic oscillators up to second order. In this case the local and normal polyads are related by an expression of the form $\hat{P}_{\mathrm{N}} = \zeta_0 + \beta_0 \hat{P}_{\mathrm{L}} + \gamma \hat{V}$, where ζ_0 and γ vanish in the local mode limit. The aim of this work is to study the LNT when $\hat{P}_{\mathrm{L}} = \hat{P}_{\mathrm{N}}$ stop being valid from the point of view of a time-dependent problem.

The use of exactly solvable models have pervaded all branches of physics. Time-independent Hamiltonian systems for instance present energy conservation, which implies that any one dimensional problem is integrable. In a more general situation, systems with n-degrees of freedom that possess n-constants of motion have separable time-independent Schrödinger equation [31], a feature that allows us to solve the corresponding differential equation in coordinate representation or to construct the corresponding propagator. Examples where this situation applies are: free particle, harmonic oscillator and motion of charged particles in uniform electromagnetic fields, whose solutions were obtained since the early days of quantum mechanics [32].

In contrast, dealing with time-dependent systems represents a more complicated situation even for one dimensional systems since the Hamiltonian is no longer a constant of motion. In particular, because of its wide range of applications the study of the dynamics to the parametric oscillator, i.e. an oscillator with time-dependent mass and frequency, has been the subject of major interest, leading to the search of exact or adiabatic invariants. An adiabatic invariant for the parametric oscillator problem was first introduced by *Lorentz* at the Solvay Congress on 1911 [33]. Later on, in 1966 *Lewis* obtained in explicit form an exact class of time-dependent invariants[1] for time-dependent one dimensional harmonic oscillator in

[1]Nowadays in the literature this invariant is known as the *Ermakov invariant* in classical mechanics or also as the *Ermakov operator* in the field of quantum mechanics, due to the fact that such invariant was reported by Ermakov in 1880 [34]. However, the Ermakov system was actually discussed six years earlier in 1874 by Steen [35]. But since the latter work was published in Danish in a journal not usually containing articles

both classical and quantum mechanical schemes [38]. *Lewis* itself together with *Riesenfeld* developed the theory of time-dependent invariants for non-stationary quantum systems, applying the developed method to the one dimensional time dependent harmonic oscillator as well as to a charged particle in a time-dependent electromagnetic field [39].

On the other hand, two years after Lewis' contribution, linear invariant operators for time-dependent oscillator were introduced by Malkin, Man'ko and Trifonov [40, 41]. These operators can be used to define generalized correlated states, which is highly convenient in many problems of quantum theory, with the additional advantage that they can be found for any N-dimensional time-dependent quadratic system.

The time evolution of quantum systems is still an important subject of research. A recent contribution proved the close relation between the dynamics and the solutions of the Ermakov and Ricatti non-linear differential equations, allowing a deeper physical insight into the systems [42–44]. Additionally, the Ermakov invariant method for solving the quantum time-dependent parametric oscillator has been connected with the so called quantum Arnold transformation, proving that both methods are equivalent [45–47]. In this contribution we shall analyze the LNT from a time-dependent point of view using the invariant operator theory. Particular attention is paid to the time-dependent polyad breaking transition by identifying the time dependent local number operators.

This article is organized as follows. Section 2 is devoted to analyze two interacting oscillators in order to establish the LNT from the local polyad breaking point of view. The aim of Section 3 is to introduce the time dependent counterpart of the LNT. In Section 4 the results of several molecular systems are presented for three cases: sudden, linear and adiabatic time-dependent evolution. Finally, in Section 5 the summary and our conclusions are presented.

2. Stationary description of vibrational states

In general, a molecular vibrational description may be carried out in local or normal mode schemes. The former case is appropriate for subspaces of equivalent oscillators where large mass ratios are present. Here we shall start considering two interacting local oscillators associated with the stretching degrees of freedom of triatomic molecules.

A molecule suitable to be described in a local mode scheme presents a relatively small splitting among the associated fundamentals. In this case a good approximation consists in a zeroth order Hamiltonian $\hat{H}_0^{\rm loc}$ corresponding to two independent oscillators plus an interaction $\hat{V}_{\rm int}^{\rm loc}$ which is expected to yield a small contribution to the energy spectrum. Hence the Hamiltonian may be written in the form

$$\hat{H}_{\rm L} = \hat{H}_0^{\rm loc} + \hat{V}_{\rm int}^{\rm loc} \,. \tag{1}$$

The interaction is proposed on the ground of carrying the most important resonances, which define in this case a local polyad $\hat{P}_{\rm L}$. As we shall show this is possible because the splitting between the energy levels is small compared with the energy separation between the fundamentals. This description is feasible for water molecule (H_2O) for instance, since the masses ratio between oxygen and hydrogen is 16:1.

on mathematics, this contribution went unnoticed until the end of last century. An English translation of the original paper and generalizations can be found in Ref. [36, 37].

On the other hand, when the molecular masses are similar and a linear geometry is present the normal modes behaviour is preferred with a Hamiltonian of the form

$$\hat{H}_{\mathrm{N}} = \hat{H}_0^{\mathrm{nor}} + \hat{V}_{\mathrm{int}}^{\mathrm{nor}}, \tag{2}$$

where in this case $\hat{H}_0^{\mathrm{nor}}$ represents the contribution of two non-interacting harmonic oscillators associated with the normal modes, while the interaction $\hat{V}_{\mathrm{int}}^{\mathrm{nor}}$ involves diagonal interactions as well as resonant terms that define the polyad $\hat{P}_{\mathrm{N}}$. This behaviour manifests by a large splitting between the fundamentals. This normal scheme describes with good accuracy the CO_2 molecule since the masses ratio between carbon and oxygen is 4:3 presenting a linear geometry.

A molecule with a local mode behaviour may also be described within the normal scheme, with the property $\hat{P}_{\mathrm{L}} = \hat{P}_{\mathrm{N}}$ being satisfied since both descriptions are connected by means of a canonical transformation [27]. In contrast, when a normal mode behaviour is present the polyad $\hat{P}_{\mathrm{L}}$ stop commuting with the Hamiltonian and $\hat{P}_{\mathrm{N}} \neq \hat{P}_{\mathrm{L}}$, as we shall prove in §2.3.

In a vibrational molecular description a major question is concerned with a criterion to identify local or normal mode behaviours. To carry out this characterization it has been recently introduced the ζ-parameter as a measure of the locality (normality) degree [30], in a similar way to the parameter used in Ref. [15]. This parameter takes into account the splitting of the fundamental modes relative to themselves, i.e.

$$\zeta = \frac{2}{\pi} \arctan\left(\frac{\Delta E}{\bar{E}}\right), \tag{3}$$

where $\bar{E}$ denotes the average of fundamental modes and ΔE the difference between them. We have found the following rough criterion: a value $\zeta < 0.1$ indicates a local character of the molecule while $\zeta > 0.1$ a normal one, with a transition region to be identified by means of several concepts [30].

2.1. *Local scheme*

The local description of the stretching degrees of freedom of a triatomic molecule of type BA_2 consists in expanding the Hamiltonian in terms of the local displacement coordinates $q_1 = r_1 - r_e$ and $q_2 = r_2 - r_e$, where r_j is the distance between the central and the j-th terminal atom, while r_e is the equilibrium distance of the molecule. Considering interactions up to quadratic order the Hamiltonian has the form

$$\hat{H} = \frac{1}{2} g_{rr}^{\circ} \sum_{i=1}^{2} \hat{p}_i^2 + \frac{1}{2} f_{rr} \sum_{i=1}^{2} \hat{q}_i^2 + g_{rr'}^{\circ} \hat{p}_1 \hat{p}_2 + f_{rr'} \hat{q}_1 \hat{q}_2 \,, \tag{4}$$

which should be identified with a Hamiltonian of the form (1). In (4) the parameters f_{rr} and $f_{rr'}$ correspond to the force constants, while g_{rr}° and $g_{rr'}^{\circ}$ are the elements of the Wilson's matrix at equilibrium [48], whose explicit expressions in this case are

$$g_{rr}^{\circ} = \frac{1}{m_{\mathrm{A}}} + \frac{1}{m_{\mathrm{B}}} \,, \qquad g_{rr'}^{\circ} = \frac{\cos\theta}{m_{\mathrm{B}}} \,, \tag{5}$$

where θ is the angle between the bonds. The Hamiltonian (4) can be translated into an algebraic representation by introducing the bosonic operators $\hat{a}_i$ and $\hat{a}_i^\dagger$ via the transformation

$$\hat{p}_i = i\,\hbar\,\alpha_0\;(\hat{a}_i^\dagger - \hat{a}_i), \qquad \hat{q}_i = \frac{1}{2\,\alpha_0}\;(\hat{a}_i^\dagger + \hat{a}_i)\,, \tag{6}$$

with

$$\alpha_0^2 = \frac{1}{2\hbar}\sqrt{\frac{f_{rr}}{g^o_{rr}}} = \frac{\mu\,\omega_0}{2\hbar}, \tag{7}$$

where the mass-type parameter is $\mu = 1/g^\circ_{rr}$ and the frequency-type parameter is $\omega_0 = \sqrt{f_{rr}\,g^\circ_{rr}}$. Insertion of the transformation (6) into the Hamiltonian (4) yields the algebraic representation

$$\hat{H} = \frac{\hbar\omega_\circ}{2}\Big\{\sum_{i=1}^{2}(a_i^\dagger a_i + a_i a_i^\dagger) + \lambda(a_1^\dagger a_2 + a_1 a_2^\dagger) + \lambda'(a_1^\dagger a_2^\dagger + a_1 a_2)\Big\}, \tag{8}$$

with

$$\lambda = (x_f + x_g)\,, \qquad \lambda' = (x_f - x_g) \tag{9}$$

where for convenience we have introduced the definitions

$$x_f = \frac{f_{rr'}}{f_{rr}}\,, \qquad x_g = \frac{g^\circ_{rr'}}{g^\circ_{rr}}\,. \tag{10}$$

We now define the local polyad as

$$\hat{P}_L = \hat{a}_1^\dagger\hat{a}_1 + \hat{a}_2^\dagger\hat{a}_2 = \hat{n}_1 + \hat{n}_2. \tag{11}$$

It is clear that the Hamiltonian (8) does not commute with $\hat{P}_L$ unless the last contribution can be neglected. When this is the case the system is identified with a local-mode behaviour with Hamiltonian:

$$\hat{H}_{\rm loc} = \frac{\hbar\,\omega_0}{2}\left[\sum_{i=1}^{2}(\hat{a}_i^\dagger\hat{a}_i + \hat{a}_i\hat{a}_i^\dagger) + \lambda\;(\hat{a}_1^\dagger\hat{a}_2 + \hat{a}_1\hat{a}_2^\dagger)\right]. \tag{12}$$

If anharmonic corrections are added to the diagonal contribution one has a Morse-like spectrum. Hence, a suitable Hamiltonian to describe the two local oscillators is

$$\hat{H}_{\rm AOHC} = \hat{H}_1^{\rm M} + \hat{H}_2^{\rm M} + \frac{\hbar\,\omega_0\,\lambda}{2}(\hat{a}_1^\dagger\hat{a}_2 + \hat{a}_1\hat{a}_2^\dagger), \tag{13}$$

where $\hat{H}_i^{\rm M}$ are Morse Hamiltonians. This model is known as the *anharmonic oscillators harmonically coupled* (AOHC) since the matrix elements of the non diagonal contribution are calculated in the harmonic approximation [14–18]. This Hamiltonian is the basis of the local mode theory developed during the 80's.

2.2. *Normal scheme*

For molecules presenting large splitting between the fundamentals ($\zeta > 0.1$) a normal-mode description is more convenient. The Hamiltonian (4) can be rewritten in terms of the normal coordinates

$$\hat{S}_g = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\hat{q}_1 + \hat{q}_2)\,, \qquad \hat{S}_u = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\hat{q}_1 - \hat{q}_2)\,, \tag{14}$$

with the corresponding induced transformation in the momenta

$$\hat{P}_g = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\hat{p}_1 + \hat{p}_2), \qquad \hat{P}_u = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\hat{p}_1 - \hat{p}_2)\,. \tag{15}$$

In these symmetry adapted coordinates the Hamiltonian is diagonal, given as two independent harmonic oscillators (normal modes), i.e.

$$\hat{H} = \frac{1}{2}(G_{gg}\hat{P}_g^2 + G_{uu}\hat{P}_u^2) + \frac{1}{2}(F_{gg}\hat{S}_g^2 + F_{uu}\hat{S}_u^2), \tag{16}$$

where

$$G_{gg} = g^{\circ}_{rr} + g^{\circ}_{rr'}\,, \qquad G_{uu} = g^{\circ}_{rr} - g^{\circ}_{rr'}\,, \tag{17}$$

$$F_{gg} = f_{rr} + f_{rr'}\,, \qquad F_{uu} = f_{rr} - f_{rr'}\,. \tag{18}$$

This is an expected result since the Hamiltonian (4) is integrable. Its corresponding algebraic representation is attained by means of the bosonic realization

$$\hat{a}^{\dagger}_{\gamma} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\hbar}}\left(\frac{1}{\alpha_{\gamma_0}}\hat{S}_{\gamma} - i\,\alpha_{\gamma_0}\hat{P}_{\gamma}\right), \qquad \hat{a}_{\gamma} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\hbar}}\left(\frac{1}{\alpha_{\gamma_0}}\hat{S}_{\gamma} + i\,\alpha_{\gamma_0}\hat{P}_{\gamma}\right), \tag{19}$$

where $\gamma = g, u$, with the definitions

$$\alpha^2_{g_0} = \sqrt{\frac{G_{gg}}{F_{gg}}} = \frac{1}{2\hbar\alpha_0^2 r}\,, \qquad \alpha^2_{u_0} = \sqrt{\frac{G_{uu}}{F_{uu}}} = \frac{1}{2\hbar\alpha_0^2 s} \tag{20}$$

where

$$r = \sqrt{\frac{1+x_f}{1+x_g}}, \qquad s = \sqrt{\frac{1-x_f}{1-x_g}}\,. \tag{21}$$

Hence, in the bosonic space the Hamiltonian takes the simple form

$$\hat{H} = \frac{\hbar\omega_g}{2}(\hat{a}^{\dagger}_g\hat{a}_g + \hat{a}_g\hat{a}^{\dagger}_g) + \frac{\hbar\omega_u}{2}(\hat{a}^{\dagger}_u\hat{a}_u + \hat{a}_u\hat{a}^{\dagger}_u)\,, \tag{22}$$

with frequencies

$$\omega_g = \omega_0\sqrt{(1+x_f)(1+x_g)}\,, \tag{23}$$

$$\omega_u = \omega_0\sqrt{(1-x_f)(1-x_g)}\,. \tag{24}$$

In a normal mode scheme the polyad takes the general form

$$\hat{P}_{\rm N} = \eta_1\,\hat{n}_g + \eta_2\,\hat{n}_u, \tag{25}$$

where $\hat{n}_\gamma = \hat{a}^\dagger_\gamma\,\hat{a}_\gamma$, while $\{\eta_1, \eta_2\}$ are integers fixed by the resonance. It should be clear that $[\hat{P}_{\rm N}, \hat{H}] = 0$ and the polyad is preserved. In the next subsection we shall prove that in general $\hat{P}_{\rm N} \neq \hat{P}_{\rm L}$ unless a local mode behaviour is enforced.

2.3. *Local-to-normal connection*

Here we establish the connection between the local scheme (12) and the normal scheme (22). Taking into account the relation between the local and normal coordinates (14) as well as the corresponding momenta (15), we obtain the connection between the normal and local bosonic operators

$$a^\dagger_g = \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2r}}\{(r+1)(a^\dagger_1 + a^\dagger_2) + (r-1)(a_1 + a_2)\}, \tag{26a}$$

$$a^\dagger_u = \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2s}}\{(s+1)(a^\dagger_1 - a^\dagger_2) + (s-1)(a_1 - a_2)\}, \tag{26b}$$

Substitution of (26) into the Hamiltonian (22) generates the Hamiltonian local representation (8). We next consider the polyad (25). The substitution of (26) into the normal polyad yields

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{P}_{\rm N} =& \zeta_0 + \beta_0\ \hat{P}_{\rm L} + \beta_1\ (\hat{a}^\dagger_1\hat{a}_2 + \hat{a}_1\hat{a}^\dagger_2) + \\ & \beta_2(\hat{a}^{\dagger 2}_1 + \hat{a}^{\dagger 2}_2 + \hat{a}^2_1 + \hat{a}^2_2) + \beta_3(\hat{a}^\dagger_1\hat{a}^\dagger_2 + \hat{a}_1\hat{a}_2),\end{aligned} \tag{27}$$

where

$$\zeta_0 = \frac{2}{8rs}[\eta_1 s(r-1)^2 + \eta_2 r(s-1)^2], \tag{28a}$$

$$\beta_0 = \frac{2}{8rs}[\eta_1 s(r^2+1) + \eta_2 r(s^2+1)], \tag{28b}$$

$$\beta_1 = \frac{2}{8rs}[\eta_1 s(r^2+1) - \eta_2 r(s^2+1)], \tag{28c}$$

$$\beta_2 = \frac{1}{8rs}[\eta_1 s(r^2-1) + \eta_2 r(s^2-1)], \tag{28d}$$

$$\beta_3 = \frac{1}{8rs}[\eta_1 s(r^2-1) - \eta_2 r(s^2-1)]. \tag{28e}$$

We have thus proved that in general $\hat{P}_{\rm N} \neq \hat{P}_{\rm L}$. The question which arises is concerned with the condition under which $\hat{P}_{\rm L} = \hat{P}_{\rm N}$. This situation is satisfied in the local limit as we next prove. As a first step it is convenient to analyze the unitary transformation:

$$\hat{a}^\dagger_g = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\hat{c}^\dagger_1 + \hat{c}^\dagger_2)\,, \qquad \hat{a}^\dagger_u = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\hat{c}^\dagger_1 - \hat{c}^\dagger_2)\,. \tag{29}$$

When (29) is inserted into the Hamiltonian (22) one obtains.

$$\hat{H} = \frac{\hbar\,\omega_{\rm nor}}{2}\sum_{i=1}^{2}(c_i^\dagger c_i + c_i c_i^\dagger) + \frac{\hbar\,\lambda_{\rm nor}}{2}(c_1^\dagger c_2 + c_1 c_2^\dagger) \tag{30}$$

with the definitions

$$\omega_{\rm nor} = \frac{\omega}{2}\left(\sqrt{(1+x_f)\,(1+x_g)} + \sqrt{(1-x_f)\,(1-x_g)}\right), \tag{31a}$$

$$\lambda_{\rm nor} = \omega\left(\sqrt{(1+x_f)\,(1+x_g)} - \sqrt{(1-x_f)\,(1-x_g)}\right). \tag{31b}$$

Notice that the local operators $\hat{c}_i^\dagger(\hat{c}_i)$ do not correspond to the physical local operators $\hat{a}_i^\dagger(\hat{a}_i)$, but their action over an isomorphic local basis may be chosen to be the same. In fact, we may establish the isomorphism

$$\hat{c}_i^\dagger \leftrightarrow \hat{a}_i^\dagger\,, \qquad \hat{c}_i \leftrightarrow \hat{a}_i\,. \tag{32}$$

The difference between the local operators $\hat{c}_i^\dagger(\hat{c}_i)$ and $\hat{a}_i^\dagger(\hat{a}_i)$ is manifested by the fact that the coefficients involved in (12) are not equal to the coefficient in (31). However, a coincidence of the spectroscopic coefficients for molecules with a local mode behaviour is expected. In order to elucidate the conditions to be satisfied we consider the Taylor series expansion of the parameters (31) as a function of x_f and x_g around zero. The result is

$$\omega_{\rm nor} = \frac{\omega_{\rm loc}}{2}\left(1 + \frac{1}{8}(x_g - x_f)^2 + \ldots\mathcal{O}(x^3)\right), \tag{33}$$

$$\lambda_{\rm nor} = \omega_{\rm loc}\left((x_g + x_f) + \frac{1}{8}(x_g^3 + x_f^3) - \frac{1}{8}(x_g^2 x_f + x_g x_f^2) + \ldots\mathcal{O}(x^4)\right). \tag{34}$$

Keeping only linear terms in x_f and x_g we arrive to the conclusion that with the conditions

$$\frac{1}{8}(x_f - x_g)^2 \ll 1; \qquad |x_f| \ll 1; \quad |x_g| \ll 1, \tag{35}$$

we recover the spectroscopic parameters associated with the interacting local oscillators. In other words, in the limit (35) the Hamiltonian (22) reduces to the local representation (8) with the spectroscopic parameters given by λ and ω_0, with $\lambda' = 0$. The condition (35) establishes the local limit, characterized by the suitability of a local model to estimate the force constants at zeroth order.

In order to see the consequences of the local condition (35) in the polyads, we expand the functions r and s in terms of x_f and x_g:

$$\begin{aligned} r &= 1 + \frac{1}{2}(x_f - x_g) - \frac{1}{8}(x_f + x_g)^2 + \frac{x_g^2}{2} + \ldots\,, \\ s &= 1 - \frac{1}{2}(x_f - x_g) - \frac{1}{8}(x_f + x_g)^2 + \frac{x_g^2}{2} + \ldots\,. \end{aligned} \tag{36a}$$

When these expansions are substituted into (28), after applying the local limit we

obtain

$$\beta_0 \approx 1; \qquad \zeta_0 = \beta_i \approx 0\,; \qquad i = 1, 2, 3. \tag{37}$$

In addition, since in the local limit the interaction between the oscillators produces a small splitting, the equality $\eta_1 = \eta_2 = 1$ is expected and therefore one gets

$$\hat{P}_{\mathrm{N}} \approx \hat{P}_{\mathrm{L}}. \tag{38}$$

Simultaneously the Bogoliubov-type transformation (26) reduces to the canonical transformation (29).

This analysis shows that starting with a local mode behaviour there is a transition region where the equality $\hat{P}_{\mathrm{L}} = \hat{P}_{\mathrm{N}}$ stop being valid as well as the estimation of the correct force constants at zeroth order in a local model. This transition may be simulated by changing the strength of the interaction in the kinetic energy, which may be interpreted as modification in the mass ratio of the atoms [49], but also through the whole transformation from a molecular system to another one [30]. In this contribution we shall consider this local-to-normal transition via a time dependent excitations in the sudden, linear and adiabatic form by modifying the inter-bond angle as a simulation of an electronic state transition. In particular we are interested in studying the system as a transient LNT involving the polyad breaking point of view.

3. Time-dependent description of vibrational states

In this contribution we study the energy level pattern of the mean value of the Hamiltonian provided by the stretching degrees of freedom of triatomic molecules when a geometrical change takes place via a time-dependent excitation through the angle $\theta(t)$ between the bonds. Hence, with this geometric dependence a molecule with local character may move to a normal mode behaviour and vice versa. From the physical point of view this situation may be considered as a simulation of an electronic state change. To achieve this goal we start by describing the evolution of the states by considering the Hamiltonian (16) in terms of symmetry adapted coordinates, where now the parameters G_{gg} and G_{uu} become time-dependent functions given by

$$G_{gg}(t) = \frac{1}{\mu} + \frac{\cos\theta(t)}{m_B}\,, \qquad G_{uu}(t) = \frac{1}{\mu} + \frac{\cos\theta(t)}{m_B}\,. \tag{39}$$

Concerning this geometrical time dependence, it is important to mention that from a physical point of view this change implies a modification of the potential energy surface and consequently a time dependence in the parameters $F_{gg}(t)$ and $F_{uu}(t)$ should in principle be considered.

3.1. *Normal scheme*

The time-evolution of the vibrational Hamiltonian (16) consists in the two independent parametric oscillators, i.e.,

$$\hat{H} = \frac{1}{2}\left\{G_{gg}(t)\hat{P}_g^2 + F_{gg}(t)\hat{S}_g^2 + G_{uu}(t)\hat{P}_u^2 + F_{uu}(t)\hat{S}_u^2\right\}\,, \tag{40}$$

where the functions $G_{gg}(t)$ and $G_{uu}(t)$ are given by (39), while the potential parameters $F_{gg}(t)$ and $F_{uu}(t)$ depend on the electronic dynamics. The solutions of the time-dependent Schrödinger equation corresponding to the above Hamiltonian may be obtained by means of the invariant operators method [38, 40, 41, 44], as we next show.

In the Heisenberg picture an operator $\hat{I}(t)$ is said to be invariant when its total time derivative vanishes, i.e.

$$\frac{d\hat{I}}{dt} = \frac{i}{\hbar}\left[\hat{H}, \hat{I}\right] + \frac{\partial \hat{I}}{\partial t} = 0 \; . \tag{41}$$

In equivalent form, in the Schrödinger picture an operator $\hat{I}(t)$ is invariant when the mean value with respect to any state is time-independent. When this is the case it is said that $\langle \hat{I} \rangle$ is a constant of motion of the system. In particular, a parametric oscillator system possesses an invariant known as the Ermakov operator [42–44], and due to the fact that the Hamiltonian (40) consists of the sum of two uncoupled parametric oscillators, its invariant takes the form: $\hat{I}(t) = \hat{I}_g(t) + \hat{I}_u(t)$, where $\hat{I}_g(t)$ and $\hat{I}_u(t)$ are Ermakov operators given by

$$\hat{I}_\gamma(t) = \frac{1}{2\hbar}\left[\left(\alpha_\gamma(t)\hat{P}_\gamma - \frac{\dot{\alpha}_\gamma(t)}{G_{\gamma\gamma}(t)}\hat{S}_\gamma\right)^2 + \left(\frac{\hat{S}_\gamma}{\alpha_\gamma(t)}\right)^2\right] ; \qquad \gamma = g,\, u. \tag{42}$$

Here each operator by itself is also an invariant of (40) and the time-dependent functions $\alpha_\gamma(t)$ are solutions to the non-linear Ermakov-type equation

$$\ddot{\alpha}_\gamma - \frac{\dot{G}_{\gamma\gamma}(t)}{G_{\gamma\gamma}(t)}\dot{\alpha}_\gamma + G_{\gamma\gamma}(t)F_{\gamma\gamma}(t)\alpha_\gamma = \frac{G^2_{\gamma\gamma}(t)}{\alpha^3_\gamma(t)} \, . \tag{43}$$

The solutions of the Schrödinger equation associated with the Hamiltonian (40) are determined by the eigenvectors of the invariant $\hat{I}_\gamma(t)$ [38, 41, 44]. In order to find such eigenvectors we should notice that each invariant $I_\gamma(t)$ can be expressed as

$$\hat{I}_\gamma(t) = \hat{A}^\dagger_\gamma(t)\hat{A}_\gamma(t) + 1/2, \tag{44}$$

where the operators $\hat{A}^\dagger_\gamma(t)$ and $\hat{A}_\gamma(t)$ are also invariant operators given by

$$\hat{A}_\gamma(t) \; = \frac{e^{i\phi_\gamma(t)}}{\sqrt{2\,\hbar}}\left[\left(\frac{1}{\alpha_\gamma(t)} - i\frac{\dot{\alpha_\gamma}(t)}{G_{\gamma\gamma}(t)}\right)\hat{S}_\gamma + i\alpha_\gamma(t)\hat{P}_\gamma\right], \tag{45a}$$

$$\hat{A}^\dagger_\gamma(t) = \frac{e^{-i\phi_\gamma(t)}}{\sqrt{2\,\hbar}}\left[\left(\frac{1}{\alpha_\gamma(t)} + i\frac{\dot{\alpha}_\gamma(t)}{G_{\gamma\gamma}(t)}\right)\hat{S}_\gamma - i\alpha_\gamma(t)\hat{P}_\gamma\right] . \tag{45b}$$

with phase factor $\phi_\gamma(t) = \int^t \frac{G_{\gamma\gamma}(\tau)}{\alpha^2_\gamma(t)}d\tau$ [50]. The linear operators (45) obey the commutation relations:

$$[\hat{A}_{\gamma'}(t), \hat{A}^\dagger_\gamma(t)] = \delta_{\gamma\gamma'}; \qquad [\hat{A}_{\gamma'}(t), \hat{A}_\gamma(t)] = [\hat{A}^\dagger_{\gamma'}(t), \hat{A}^\dagger_\gamma(t)] = 0, \tag{46}$$

and consequently they possess the same algebraic properties as the bosonic operators associated with the harmonic oscillator corresponding to the well-known Heisenberg–Weyl group H_4 [51]. Hence the Hilbert space can be spanned by the

time-dependent Fock states $|n_\gamma, t\rangle$

$$|n_\gamma, t\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n_\gamma\,!}}\left[\hat{A}^\dagger_\gamma(t)\right]^{n_\gamma}|0_\gamma, t\rangle\,. \tag{47}$$

The eigenvectors of the Ermakov operator $\hat{I}_\gamma(t)$ are then the states $|n_\gamma, t\rangle$ with eigenvalues $n_\gamma + 1/2$. Taking the direct product $|n_g, n_u, t\rangle = |n_g, t\rangle \otimes |n_u, t\rangle$, we have for the eigensystem associated with $\hat{I}(t)$:

$$\hat{I}(t)|n_g, n_u, t\rangle = (n_g + n_u + 1)\,|n_g, n_u, t\rangle. \tag{48}$$

The expression for the ground states $|0_\gamma, t\rangle$ in the position representation is attained by solving the partial differential equation defined by the equation $\langle S_\gamma|\hat{A}_\gamma|0_\gamma, t\rangle = 0$, whose normalized solution is given by

$$\psi_{0_\gamma}(S_\gamma, t) = \frac{1}{(\pi\hbar)^{1/4}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha_\gamma(t)}}\exp\left\{\frac{i}{2\,\hbar\,G_{\gamma\gamma}(t)}\left(\frac{\dot{\alpha}_\gamma(t)}{\alpha_\gamma(t)} + i\frac{G_{\gamma\gamma}(t)}{\alpha^2_\gamma(t)}\right)S^2_\gamma - \frac{i}{2}\int^t\frac{G_{\gamma\gamma}(\tau)}{\alpha^2_\gamma(\tau)}d\tau\right\}. \tag{49}$$

On the other hand, from the ground state $\psi_{0_\gamma}(S_\gamma, t)$ and the definition (47) it is possible to find the wave function for an arbitrary Fock state through successive applications of the creation operator $\hat{A}^\dagger_\gamma(t)$, wherefore one obtains that

$$\psi_{n_\gamma}(S_\gamma, t) = \frac{\psi_{0_\gamma}(S_\gamma, t)}{\sqrt{2^{n_\gamma}n_\gamma!}}H_{n_\gamma}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{\hbar}}\frac{S_\gamma}{\alpha_\gamma(t)}\right)e^{i\,n_\gamma\,\phi_\gamma(t)}\,. \tag{50}$$

Finally, by direct substitution it is not difficult to prove that the wave functions

$$\Psi_{n_g n_u}(S_g, S_u, t) = \psi_{n_g}(S_g, t)\,\psi_{n_u}(S_u, t) \tag{51}$$

are solutions of the time-dependent Schrödinger equation associated with the Hamiltonian (40).

To complete the study of the system dynamics, we include the evolution of the quantum uncertainties for each parametric oscillator, defined as

$$\sigma^2_{S_\gamma}(t) = \langle\hat{S}^2_\gamma\rangle - \langle\hat{S}_\gamma\rangle^2\,, \qquad \sigma^2_{P_\gamma}(t) = \langle\hat{P}^2_\gamma\rangle - \langle\hat{P}_\gamma\rangle^2\,, \tag{52}$$

as well as the evolution of their correlation,

$$\sigma_{S_\gamma P_\gamma}(t) = \frac{1}{2}\langle\hat{S}_\gamma\hat{P}_\gamma + \hat{P}_\gamma\hat{S}_\gamma\rangle - \langle\hat{S}_\gamma\rangle\langle\hat{P}_\gamma\rangle\,, \tag{53}$$

which can be determined by direct computation of the mean values with respect to the wave functions (50), a task that yields

$$\sigma^2_{S_\gamma}(t) = \frac{h}{2}\,\alpha^2_\gamma(t)(2\,n_\gamma + 1)\,, \tag{54}$$

$$\sigma^2_{P_\gamma}(t) = \frac{h}{2}\left[\left(\frac{\dot{\alpha}_\gamma(t)}{G_{\gamma\gamma}(t)}\right)^2 + \frac{1}{\alpha^2_\gamma(t)}\right](2\,n_\gamma + 1)\,, \tag{55}$$

$$\sigma_{S_\gamma P_\gamma}(t) = \frac{h}{2}\,\frac{1}{G_{\gamma\gamma}(t)}\,\dot{\alpha}_\gamma(t)\,\alpha_\gamma(t)(2\,n_\gamma + 1)\,. \tag{56}$$

Moreover, since the mean value of the Hamiltonian (40) has the form

$$\langle\, \hat{H}\,\rangle(t) = \sum_{\gamma=g,\,u} \frac{G_{\gamma\gamma}(t)}{2}\sigma^2_{P_\gamma}(t) + \frac{F_{\gamma\gamma}(t)}{2}\sigma^2_{S_\gamma}(t)\,, \tag{57}$$

and consequently it can be computed with the help of expressions (54) and (55). Therefore, from this analysis we see that the dynamics of the quantum properties is completely determined by the solutions of the nonlinear Ermakov equation (43) with the initial conditions

$$\alpha_\gamma(t_0) \equiv \alpha_{0_\gamma} = \left(\frac{G_{\gamma\gamma}(t_0)}{F_{\gamma\gamma}(t_0)}\right)^{\frac{1}{4}} \qquad \dot{\alpha}_\gamma(t_0) \equiv \dot{\alpha}_{0_\gamma} = 0\,. \tag{58}$$

From this initial condition, we notice that the solution $\alpha_\gamma(t)$ has dimensions of $[time/mass]^{-1/2}$, which in practice is taken to be $[fs/amu]^{-1/2}$.

In this time-dependent description the normal polyad defined by $\hat{P}_{\rm N} = \eta_1\,\hat{n}_g + \eta_2\,\hat{n}_u$ is not a good quantum number anymore since it is not an invariant operator for the system. Indeed, the time evolution for its mean value takes the form

$$\langle \hat{P}_{\rm N}\rangle(t) = \frac{1}{2\hbar}\sum_{\gamma=g,\,u}\eta_i\left[\alpha^2_{\gamma_0}\sigma^2_{P_\gamma}(t) + \frac{1}{\alpha^2_{\gamma_0}}\sigma^2_{S_\gamma}(t)\right] - 1\,, \tag{59}$$

which is a time-dependent quantity. However, if we now define the time-dependent normal polyad, $\hat{\mathscr{P}}_{\rm N}(t)$, in the following form

$$\hat{\mathscr{P}}_{\rm N}(t) = \eta_1\,\hat{A}^\dagger_g(t)\hat{A}_g(t) + \eta_2\,\hat{A}^\dagger_u(t)\hat{A}_u(t) = \eta_1\,\hat{N}_g(t) + \eta_2\,\hat{N}_u(t) \tag{60}$$

where as in the stationary case the integers $\{\eta_1, \eta_2\}$ are fixed by the resonance at initial time, we have by construction an invariant operator with mean value $\langle\hat{\mathscr{P}}_{\rm N}\rangle = \eta_1\,n_g + \eta_2\,n_u$. At the initial time $t = t_0$ the polyad (60) coincides to the stationary normal polyad, i.e. $\hat{\mathscr{P}}_{\rm N}(t_0) = \hat{P}_{\rm N}$, since $\hat{A}^\dagger_\gamma(t_0) = \hat{a}^\dagger_\gamma$ and $\hat{A}_\gamma(t_0) = \hat{a}_\gamma$.

3.2. *Local scheme*

Let us now turn our attention to the molecular description in terms of local coordinates. The time-dependent Hamiltonians (40) reads

$$\hat{H} = \frac{1}{2}g^\circ_{rr}\sum_{i=1}^{2}\hat{p}^2_i + \frac{1}{2}f_{rr}(t)\sum_{i=1}^{2}\hat{q}^2_i + g^\circ_{rr'}(t)\hat{p}_1\hat{p}_2 + f_{rr'}(t)\hat{q}_1\hat{q}_2\,. \tag{61}$$

Since the connection between the local and normal coordinates is given by the canonical transformation (14), the operators $\hat{A}_\gamma(t)$ and $\hat{A}^\dagger_\gamma(t)$, – as well as the Ermakov invariant $\hat{I}(t)$ and the polyad $\hat{\mathscr{P}}_{\rm N}(t)$ – are invariant operators of the Hamiltonian (61). These operators when written in terms of the local coordinates $(\hat{q}_j, \hat{p}_j)$ take the form

$$\hat{A}_g(t) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left[\hat{A}_{1g}(t) + \hat{A}_{2g}(t)\right]\,, \quad \hat{A}_u(t) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left[\hat{A}_{1u}(t) - \hat{A}_{2u}(t)\right]\,, \tag{62}$$

with the local bosonic operators $\hat{A}^{\dagger}_{j\gamma}(t)$ and $\hat{A}_{j\gamma}(t)$ given by

$$\hat{A}_{j\gamma}(t) = \frac{e^{i\phi_\gamma(t)}}{\sqrt{2\,\hbar}}\left[\left(\frac{1}{\alpha_\gamma(t)} - i\frac{\dot{\alpha_\gamma}(t)}{G_{\gamma\gamma}(t)}\right)\,\hat{q}_j + i\alpha_\gamma(t)\,\hat{p}_j\right], \tag{63}$$

$$\hat{A}^{\dagger}_{j\gamma}(t) = \frac{e^{-i\phi_\gamma(t)}}{\sqrt{2\,\hbar}}\left[\left(\frac{1}{\alpha_\gamma(t)} + i\frac{\dot{\alpha_\gamma}(t)}{G_{\gamma\gamma}(t)}\right)\,\hat{q}_j - i\alpha_\gamma(t)\,\hat{p}_j\right], \tag{64}$$

where $j = 1,\, 2$. It is worth noticing that the operators $\hat{A}_{j\gamma}(t)$ and $\hat{A}^{\dagger}_{j\gamma}(t)$ by themselves are not invariant operators of (61).

To analyze the local limit (35) for the time-dependent case, we shall consider the conditions (35). These conditions will help us to elucidate how the local-to-normal and the normal-to-local transitions take place, as we shall see below.

From Ermakov-type equation (43) it is straightforward to show that in the local limit (35) the solutions $\alpha_g(t)$ and $\alpha_u(t)$ coincide, i.e. $\alpha_g(t) = \alpha_u(t) = \alpha(t)$, and both become solution to the Ermakov equation

$$\ddot{\alpha} + \omega^2(t)\alpha = \frac{1}{\mu^2\alpha^3}\,, \tag{65}$$

with initial conditions

$$\alpha(t_0) \equiv \alpha_0 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\mu\,\omega(t_0)}}\,, \qquad \dot{\alpha}(t_0) = \dot{\alpha}_0 = 0\,, \tag{66}$$

considering the time-dependent frequency $\omega(t) = \sqrt{g^{\circ}_{rr} f_{rr}(t)}$ and the reduced mass $\mu = 1/g^{\circ}_{rr}$. Moreover, it is not difficult to see that $\hat{A}_{1g}(t) = \hat{A}_{1u}(t) = \hat{A}_1(t)$ and $\hat{A}_{2g}(t) = \hat{A}_{2u}(t) = \hat{A}_2(t)$. Therefore the connection between normal and local bosonic operators become

$$\hat{A}_g(t) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left[\hat{A}_1(t) + \hat{A}_2(t)\right], \quad \hat{A}_u(t) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left[\hat{A}_1(t) - \hat{A}_2(t)\right], \tag{67}$$

where

$$\hat{A}_j(t) = \frac{e^{i\phi(t)}}{\sqrt{2\,\hbar}}\left[\left(\frac{1}{\alpha(t)} - i\frac{\dot{\alpha}(t)}{\mu}\right)\,\hat{q}_j + i\alpha(t)\,\hat{p}_j\right], \tag{68}$$

with $j = 1,\, 2$, and $\alpha(t)$ is solution of (65). From (62-64) and (67-68) the connection between the local operators $\hat{a}^{\dagger}_i(\hat{a}_i)$ and the time dependent operators $\hat{A}^{\dagger}_i(t)(\hat{A}_i(t))$ can be established. This correspondence is shown in the Appendix A.

The Ermakov operator in local coordinates takes the form

$$\hat{I}_{\rm L}(t) = \hat{A}^{\dagger}_1(t)\hat{A}_1(t) + \hat{A}^{\dagger}_2(t)\hat{A}_2(t) + 1, \tag{69}$$

with eigenstates $|n_1, n_2, t\rangle = |n_1, t\rangle\otimes|n_2, t\rangle$ and corresponding eigenvalues: n_1+n_2+1. The wave functions of the Schrödinger equation in the position representation are given by

$$\Psi_{n_1 n_2}(q_1, q_2, t) = \psi_{n_1}(q_1, t)\,\psi_{n_2}(q_2, t). \tag{70}$$

The ground state of these functions are determined by

$$\psi_{0_j}(q_j,t) = \frac{1}{(\pi\hbar)^{1/4}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha(t)}}\exp\left\{\frac{i\mu}{2\,\hbar}\left(\frac{\dot{\alpha}_(t)}{\alpha(t)} + i\frac{1}{\mu\,\alpha^2(t)}\right)q_j^2 - \frac{i}{2}\int^t \frac{d\tau}{\mu\,\alpha^2(\tau)}\right\}, \quad (71)$$

while for the wave functions $\psi_{n_j}(q_j,t)$:

$$\psi_{n_j}(q_j,t) = \frac{\psi_{0_j}(q_j,t)}{\sqrt{2^{n_j}n_j!}}H_{n_j}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{\hbar}}\frac{q_j}{\alpha(t)}\right)e^{i\,n_j\,\phi(t)}\,. \quad (72)$$

The time evolution of the mean values of the local polyad $\hat{P}_{\rm L} = \hat{n}_1 + \hat{n}_2$, has in general the time-dependent form

$$\langle\hat{P}_{\rm L}\rangle(t) = \frac{1}{2\hbar}\sum_{\gamma=g,u}\left[\mu\omega\sigma^2_{S_\gamma}(t) + \frac{1}{m\omega}\sigma^2_{P_\gamma}(t)\right] - 1 \quad (73)$$

whereby it is straightforward to see that it is not a preserved quantity and consequently it does not provide a good quantum number. However, the appearance of the local operators $\hat{A}_1(t)$ and $\hat{A}_2(t)$ suggests the introduction of the time-dependent local polyad operator as

$$\hat{\mathscr{P}}_{\rm L}(t) = \hat{A}_1^\dagger(t)\hat{A}_1(t) + \hat{A}_2^\dagger(t)\hat{A}_2(t) = \hat{N}_1(t) + \hat{N}_2(t) \quad (74)$$

which is preserved in time in the local limit and whose mean value corresponds to $\langle\hat{\mathscr{P}}_{\rm L}\rangle = n_1 + n_2$. At initial time t_0 the local polyad (74) coincides with the stationary local polyad $\hat{P}_{\rm L}$, i.e. $\hat{\mathscr{P}}_{\rm L}(t_0) = \hat{P}_{\rm L}$. The connection between normal and the local time-dependent polyads is via the local limit (35)

$$\lim_{|x(t)|<<1}\hat{\mathscr{P}}_{\rm N}(t) = \hat{\mathscr{P}}_{\rm L}(t)\,. \quad (75)$$

We may also consider the inverse process, i.e. when the evolution of a local molecule evolves with an increasing functions of time for the parameters $x_f(t)$ and $x_g(t)$. At the beginning of the evolution the states can be labeled by the $\hat{\mathscr{P}}_{\rm L}(t)$. However, when the conditions (35) are not satisfied the time-dependent local polyad is not a good label anymore. This is the time-dependent version of the polyad breaking phenomenon discussed in §2.3.

3.3. *Time-dependent molecular behaviour*

It has been shown that the time-dependent mode behaviour of the molecule is strongly related to the evolution to the functions $x_f(t)$ and $x_g(t)$. It is important however to quantitatively characterize the behaviour of the molecule. To achieve this goal we consider the time evolution of the ζ-parameter defined in (3), i.e

$$\zeta(t) = \frac{2}{\pi}\arctan\left(\frac{\Delta E(t)}{\bar{E}(t)}\right), \quad (76)$$

where

$$\Delta E(t) = |\langle H\rangle_{\nu_g}(t) - \langle H\rangle_{\nu_u}(t)|\,, \qquad \bar{E}(t) = \frac{\langle H\rangle_{\nu_g}(t) + \langle H\rangle_{\nu_u}(t)}{2}\,, \quad (77)$$

Table 1. Spectroscopic parameters of molecules A_2B type

	$f_{rr}{}^a$	$f_{rr'}{}^a$	x_f	$g^\circ_{rr}{}^b$	$g^\circ_{rr'}{}^b$	x_g	θ_0	θ_f	$E_{\nu_1}{}^c$	$E_{\nu_3}{}^c$	ζ
CO_2 [52]	15.97	1.232	0.077	0.1458	-0.083	-0.571	180	104.5	1285.4	2349.1	0.337
NO_2 [53]	10.91	1.935	0.177	0.1339	-0.050	-0.373	134.3	104.5	1319.8	1619	0.128
O_3 [54]	6.164	1.603	0.260	0.125	-0.028	-0.225	116.8	180	1104.3	1038.7	0.039
H_2O [55]	8.093	-0.157	-0.019	1.063	-0.016	-0.015	104.5	180	3657.1	3755.9	0.017

[a] $[\mathrm{aJ}\mathring{A}^{-2}]$

[b] $[\mathrm{amu}^{-1}]$

[c] $[\mathrm{cm}^{-1}]$

being $\langle H\rangle_{\nu_\gamma}(t)$ the energy of the fundamental modes. Therefore, the time-dependent parameter $\zeta(t)$ characterizes the time-dependent evolution of the molecular behaviour. When this parameter decreases the splitting between states of the same polyad decreases going to degeneracy, which implies that both $\alpha_g(t)$ and $\alpha_u(t)$ simultaneously approach to $\alpha(t)$: $\hat{\mathscr{P}}_{\mathrm{N}} \to \hat{\mathscr{P}}_{\mathrm{L}}$. When the parameter ζ increases the splitting between states increases too.

The time dependent change in the angle between bonds, $\theta(t)$, can produce either local-to-normal or normal-to-local mode transition depending on the geometrical and/or mass change, since $\theta(t)$ can modify the functions $x_f(t)$ and $x_g(t)$. Some examples are given in the next section.

4. Local-to-normal and normal-to-local mode transitions

Along the previous discussion it has been established the conditions under which either a local-to-normal or a normal-to-local mode transition takes place for triatomic molecules via a time-dependent excitation through a geometrical change $\theta(t)$. In this section we study these kind of transitions for two local molecules, H_2O and O_3, going to a normal mode behaviour, and for two normal molecules, CO_2 and NO_2, going to a local mode behaviour. These molecules have been classified by means of the ζ-parameter shown in table 1.The spectroscopic parameters of these molecules are also displayed in Table 1.

The transitions are performed in sudden, linear and adiabatic form, established by

$$\theta_{\mathrm{sud}}(t) = \begin{cases} \theta_0 & t < t_0 \\ \theta_f & t_0 \le t \end{cases}, \tag{78}$$

$$\theta_{\mathrm{lin}}(t) = \begin{cases} \theta_0 & t < t_0 \\ \frac{\theta_f - \theta_0}{t_f - t_0}\,(t - t_0) + \theta_0 & t_0 \le t < t_f \\ \theta_f & t_f \le t \end{cases}, \tag{79}$$

$$\theta_{\mathrm{adi}}(t) = \theta_0 + \frac{\theta_f - \theta_0}{1 + 2\,e^{-2\,k\,t}}\,, \tag{80}$$

respectively. In all the cases the angle goes from the initial value θ_0 at t_0 time, to the final value θ_f at t_f time. In particular, for the adiabatic case the initial angle θ_0 takes place at $t_0 = -\infty$ while the final angle θ_f at $t_f = \infty$. Besides in

transformation (80) the parameter k modulates the angle change speed. For the linear and the adiabatic cases all the quantum properties are obtained using the numerical solution of the Ermakov equation (43), with the spectroscopic parameters given in Table 1. In the sudden case as one goes from an initial Hamiltonian $\hat{H}_0$ to a final Hamiltonian $\hat{H}_f$, and the evolution of the quantum observables are obtained taking into account that before the change, the states are eigenstates of the initial Hamiltonian $\hat{H}_0$ and immediately after the change the same states evolved in the final Hamiltonian $\hat{H}_f$, as discussed in Ref. [56]. For the examples developed here we consider for the sake of simplification that the parameters $F_{\gamma\gamma}(t)$ with $\gamma = \{u, g\}$, are constants taking their initial value at $F_{\gamma\gamma}(t_0)$.

4.1. *Local-to-Normal mode transition*

Water and ozone molecules present a strong local-mode behaviour. For these molecules we have performed a time-dependent change in their geometry, going from a bending geometry with θ_0 to a linear geometry with $\theta_f = 180°$, as displayed in Table 1. So, by means of the solution of the Ermakov equation $\alpha_g(t)$ and $\alpha_u(t)$ the position and momentum uncertainties were constructed from expressions (54) and (55) and via the result (57) the evolution of the mean value of the Hamiltonian is obtained.

Figure 1 displays the time evolution of the mean values of the Hamiltonian (16), $\langle\hat{H}\rangle(t)$, for the molecules of interest. Sudden, linear and adiabatic changes are presented. As expected, for times before t_0 the molecular states are grouped by polyads, i.e. states of the same polyad have small splitting between them.

For the water molecule, left panels of Figure 1, as soon as time evolution starts the splitting between the states belonging to a given polyad increases. When the molecule reaches the linear geometry at t_f the splitting remains constant. In this system the angle change does not induce a local-to-normal mode behavior as manifested by the local polyad preserving mean values of the Hamiltonian.

For ozone molecule O_3, right panels in Figure 1, the splitting of the states grouped by polyad decrease rapidly and collapse into a single state, but later on they are reorganized and the splitting increases reaching constant values. The collapse to a harmonic oscillator degenerate levels is due to the cancellation of the $(x_g + x_f)$ term. It becomes clear that in this case a geometry change induces a normal mode behaviour, which is explained by the unit mass ratio. Here the strong interaction between states of different polyad become apparent. A polyad breaking is present manifested by the overlapping of the polyads.

In Figure 2 the $\zeta(t)$ parameter for the two molecules H_2O and O_3 in the adiabatic case is displayed. In both cases the function $\zeta(t)$ increases as time evolves. For water molecule the final value $\zeta(t_f) = 0.050$ indicates that this molecule does not change its local behavior. Conversely, the ozone final value $\zeta(t_f) = 0.174$ reflects the normal behaviour of this molecule after the excitation. This final values are in accordance with the latter discussion.

Figure 3 is devoted to show the behaviour of the energy levels belonging to a specific polyad, *e.g.*, the fourth for symmetric states, during the three different excitation paths. It is clear that there is a dependence in the final state with the way of excitation. In both molecules the sudden change leads to states at different energy in comparison to the others excitation types. We believe this behaviour is due to the approximation taken for the sudden change.



Figure 1. Evolution of the mean value of the Hamiltonian in units of amu$\mathring{A}^2/fs$, while the time is measure in fs (femtoseconds) and the mass in amu(atomic mass units). The continuous lines stand for the gerade states and dashed lines for the ungerade.



Figure 2. $\zeta(t)$ function for local molecules. Only the adiabatic change is shown.

4.2. *Normal-to-Local mode transition*

To illustrate the normal-to-local transition we consider the molecules NO_2 and CO_2, where in both cases the angle between bonds decreases in time until it attains the value $\theta_f = 104.5°$. Following the same procedure described in the above



Figure 3. States of the fourth polyad for molecules with local behaviour. The continuous line stands for the adiabatic change, the short dashed line for the sudden change and the long dashed for the linear change.



Figure 4. Average value ($umaÅ^2/fs$) of Hamiltonian along the time (fs) for molecules with normal behaviour. The continuous lines stand for the symmetrical states and dashed lines for the asymmetrical.

subsection and using the spectroscopic parameters given in Table 1, the mean values of the Hamiltonian are calculated and displayed in Figure 4. From the right hand side panel of this figure one appreciates a clear normal-mode behaviour at initial time t_0 for the CO_2 molecule. A local polyad cannot be identified at any energy range. The left panels correspond to the evolution of the energy pattern of the NO_2 molecule, where in the low lying energy region a local polyad trend can be seen, but immediately the local polyads start approaching making difficult the

polyad identification of the states.

In both cases the excitation induces a local polyad preserving levels trend, but for the states of the NO_2 molecule a collapse into a single state characterized by a local polyad appears due to the same reason explained above. We can observe an initial strong normal pattern, followed by a normal-to-local mode transition manifested by groups of local polyads. Now the $\hat{\mathscr{P}}_{\rm L}$ can be use to label the states.



Figure 5. $\zeta(t)$ function for local molecules. Only it is shown the adiabatic change.

The function $\zeta(t)$ for these molecules is displayed in Figure 5. We observe that the value of this parameter decreases to $\zeta(t_f) = 0.042$ for the CO_2 and $\zeta(t_f) = 0.023$ for NO_2, indicating the local character. These molecules represent a situation where the normal-to-local transition allows a correlation diagram to be established, a feature that makes evident the polyad breaking phenomenon.



Figure 6. States of the fourth polyad for molecules with normal behaviour. The continuous line stands for the adiabatic change, the short dashed line for the sudden change while the long dashed for the linear change.

Figure 6 shows the comparison between the three different excitation paths for the three symmetric states belonging to the fourth polyad. Again, like in the local case there is a final state dependence of the type of excitation. The sudden change shows a clear different behaviour due to the crude approximation involved.

For sake of comparison, in Figure 7 the energy correlation for NO_2 and O_3 molecules as a function of the angle is displayed. These should be compared to the first right panel of Figure 1 and to the first left panel of Figure 4, respectively, where energy levels convergence also appears due to cancellation effects in (x_g+x_f). The angles corresponding to high degeneracy coincide with the associated time dependent angle.

Finally, in Figure 8 the time evolution of the expectation value of the local polyad $\langle \hat{P}_{\rm L} \rangle(t)$, given in expression (73), is compared to the expectation value $\langle \hat{\mathscr{P}}_{\rm N} \rangle(t)$.



Figure 7. Energy correlation of NO_2 molecule in function of θ.



Figure 8. Time-evolution of the expectation values of the local polyad $\langle \hat{P}_{\rm L} \rangle(t)$ for the molecules under consideration. The expectation value of the normal polyad $\langle \hat{\mathscr{P}}_{\rm N} \rangle(t) = 2$ is constant. This evolution is only given for the adiabatic change.

With this analysis we stress the non conservation in time of the expectation value of the local polyad $P_{\rm L}$. In every molecular system $\langle \hat{\mathscr{P}}_{\rm N} \rangle(t) = 2$ since we are considering polyad 2, but of course this is not the case for $\langle \hat{P}_{\rm L} \rangle(t)$. The strongest local character is represented by the water molecule (upper left panel), whose time evolution of the expectation values of the local and normal polyads looks similar. However when the molecule moves to the linear configuration, small oscillation appears as a consequence of the weak local-to-normal transition. In ozone molecule, although presenting local character, a significant difference between the $\langle \hat{\mathscr{P}}_{\rm N} \rangle(t)$ and $\langle \hat{P}_{\rm L} \rangle(t)$ is present. As the transition to normal character is carried out the change in $\langle \hat{P}_{\rm L} \rangle(t)$ becomes significant since in this case $|x_g(t)|$ becomes large. As noticed the oscillation amplitude is significantly larger than in water. Let us now consider the NO_2 molecule at the left part of the panel, which presents a larger coupling between the local oscillators . This explains the larger difference between $\langle \hat{\mathscr{P}}_{\rm N} \rangle(t)$ and $\langle \hat{P}_{\rm L} \rangle(t)$. Since in this molecule the angle is diminished, the normal mode character increases, approaching $\langle \hat{\mathscr{P}}_{\rm L} \rangle(t)$ to $\langle \hat{P}_{\rm N} \rangle(t)$. Finally the behaviour for the carbon dioxide is displayed in the lower right panel of Figure 8. Here the molecule changes from linear to non linear geometry, manifested by a normal-to-

local character. At first because its strong normal character the difference between the expected values of the polyads are very different, but as the molecule loses its normal character the expectation values approach. Notice that in all cases oscillations appear, without caring if the transition comes from a normal or local character.

5. Summary and Conclusions

In this work we have established a transient transition region from local to normal mode behaviour by identifying the condition under which the local polyad $\hat{P}_{\mathrm{L}}$ stop being preserved. This condition is closely related to the suitability of a local model to estimate the force constants at zeroth order. Hence a polyad defined in a normal mode scheme can be expressed in terms of the polyad in a local mode scheme with additional non polyad preserving terms. As the splitting between the fundamentals decreases these polyads become equal. This is a remarkable behaviour allowing the polyad breaking process to be studied in different ways. One possibility is to consider the local-to-normal mode transition in parametric way by introducing different tools like probability densities, fidelity, entropy and Poincaré sections [30]. Another point of view consists in considering a time dependent evolution in the parameters leading to the transition.

In this contribution we have payed attention to the transition via a time dependent evolution. We have first presented the time dependent solution of two independent harmonic oscillators through the invariants theory. Then a local point of view is analyzed identifying the local time dependent operators associated with the local polyad. In this way the time-dependent local-to-normal mode transition has been established through time dependent polyad breaking phenomenon.

Several systems has been analyzed, two (H_2O and O_3) belonging to a local mode behaviour and other two (CO_2 and NO_2) presenting normal mode behaviour. In all cases the transition has been carried out via sudden, linear and adiabatic ways. The time dependent evolution was introduced through a change in geometry by modifying the angle in accordance with the time dependence. In our analysis a clear polyad breaking process is manifested in ozone, while in water even a change of geometry does not induced the polyad breaking phenomenon, which is explained by the mass ratios. In CO_2 and NO_2 a transient process is manifested to local energy grouping by local polyads. Except for the sudden approximation in ozone and NO_2 a convergent points of energy level degeneracy by polyad is presented due to the cancellation of the term $(x_f + x_g)$. It has been introduced the locality degree (76), which provides a polyad breaking measure from the local point of view.

We believe that this is a non trivial time dependent analysis focusing on the local polyad breaking allowing us to simulate a dynamical study of systems that change geometry during an electronic transition.

Acknowledges

This work was supported by DGAPA-UNAM under project IN109113 and CONACyT with reference number 238494. Second author is also grateful for the scholarship (Posgrado en Ciencias Químicas) provided by CONACyT, México. We thanks *Octavio Castaños Garza* for his comments and the critical reading of the manuscript.

Appendix A. Relation between the local operators

In general the local bosonic operators $\{\hat{a}_j, \hat{a}_j^\dagger\}$, $j = 1, 2$, are related to the temporal invariants $\{\hat{A}_\gamma(t), \hat{A}_\gamma^\dagger(t)\}$, $\gamma = g, u$, by means of the matrix relation

$$\begin{pmatrix} \hat{a}_1 \\ \hat{a}_1^\dagger \\ \hat{a}_2 \\ \hat{a}_2^\dagger \end{pmatrix} = \sqrt{\frac{\mu\omega}{2}} \begin{pmatrix} \chi_g(t) + \frac{i\zeta_g(t)}{\mu\omega} & \chi_g^*(t) + \frac{i\zeta_g^*(t)}{\mu\omega} & \chi_u(t) + \frac{i\zeta_u(t)}{\mu\omega} & \chi_u^*(t) + \frac{i\zeta_u^*(t)}{\mu\omega} \\ \chi_g(t) - \frac{i\zeta_g(t)}{\mu\omega} & \chi_g^*(t) - \frac{i\zeta_g^*(t)}{\mu\omega} & \chi_u(t) - \frac{i\zeta_u(t)}{\mu\omega} & \chi_u^*(t) - \frac{i\zeta_u^*(t)}{\mu\omega} \\ \chi_g(t) + \frac{i\zeta_g(t)}{\mu\omega} & \chi_g^*(t) + \frac{i\zeta_g^*(t)}{\mu\omega} & -\chi_u(t) - \frac{i\zeta_u(t)}{\mu\omega} & -\chi_u^*(t) - \frac{i\zeta_u^*(t)}{\mu\omega} \\ \chi_g(t) - \frac{i\zeta_g(t)}{\mu\omega} & \chi_g^*(t) - \frac{i\zeta_g^*(t)}{\mu\omega} & -\chi_g(t) + \frac{i\zeta_g(t)}{\mu\omega} & -\chi_g^*(t) + \frac{i\zeta_g^*(t)}{\mu\omega} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \hat{A}_g(t) \\ \hat{A}_g^\dagger(t) \\ \hat{A}_u(t) \\ \hat{A}_u^\dagger(t) \end{pmatrix}, \tag{A1}$$

where

$$\chi_\gamma(t) = \frac{\alpha_\gamma(t)}{2} e^{-i\phi_\gamma}, \quad \zeta_\gamma(t) = \frac{e^{-i\phi_\gamma}}{2i} \left(\frac{1}{\alpha_\gamma(t)} + i\frac{\dot{\alpha}_\gamma}{G_{\gamma\gamma}} \right). \tag{A2}$$

From (A1) we are able to find the temporal evolution of the local polyad $\hat{P}_{\rm L} = \hat{n}_1 + \hat{n}_2$, where $\hat{n}_1$ and $\hat{n}_2$ will be functions of the operators $\{\hat{A}_\gamma(t), \hat{A}_\gamma^\dagger(t)\}$. In addition, it is possible to obtain the average values associated with the local polyad through the eigenstates of the operators $\{\hat{A}_\gamma(t), \hat{A}_\gamma^\dagger(t)\}$, i.e.

$$\langle \hat{P}_{\rm L} \rangle = \langle n_g, n_u, t | \hat{P}_{\rm L} | n_g, n_u, t \rangle . \tag{A3}$$

The result of this calculation is given by the equation (73).

It is also possible to express the set $\{\hat{a}_j, \hat{a}_j^\dagger\}$ in terms of the operators $\{\hat{A}_{j\gamma}, \hat{A}_{j\gamma}^\dagger\}$ through the relation (62). In particular in the local limit this relations takes the form (67), i.e.

$$\begin{pmatrix} \hat{A}_g(t) \\ \hat{A}_g^\dagger(t) \\ \hat{A}_u(t) \\ \hat{A}_u^\dagger(t) \end{pmatrix} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \hat{A}_1(t) \\ \hat{A}_1^\dagger(t) \\ \hat{A}_2(t) \\ \hat{A}_2^\dagger(t) \end{pmatrix}, \tag{A4}$$

and taking into account that in this limit $\alpha_g(t) = \alpha_u(t) = \alpha(t)$, then

$$\begin{pmatrix} \hat{a}_1 \\ \hat{a}_1^\dagger \\ \hat{a}_2 \\ \hat{a}_2^\dagger \end{pmatrix} = \sqrt{\mu\omega} \begin{pmatrix} \chi(t) + \frac{i\zeta(t)}{\mu\omega} & \chi^*(t) + \frac{i\zeta^*(t)}{\mu\omega} & 0 & 0 \\ \chi(t) - \frac{i\zeta(t)}{\mu\omega} & \chi^*(t) - \frac{i\zeta^*(t)}{\mu\omega} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \chi(t) + \frac{i\zeta(t)}{\mu\omega} & \chi^*(t) + \frac{i\zeta^*(t)}{\mu\omega} \\ 0 & 0 & \chi(t) - \frac{i\zeta(t)}{\mu\omega} & \chi^*(t) - \frac{i\zeta^*(t)}{\mu\omega} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \hat{A}_1(t) \\ \hat{A}_1^\dagger(t) \\ \hat{A}_2(t) \\ \hat{A}_2^\dagger(t) \end{pmatrix}, \tag{A5}$$

from which we can obtain the temporal evolution of the local polyad $\hat{P}_{\rm L}$ in the local limit. The average values of this oparator may be calculated by means of the eigenstates of $\{\hat{A}_j, \hat{A}_j^\dagger\}$, which yields

$$\langle n_1, n_2, t | \hat{P}_{\rm L} | n_1, n_2, t \rangle = \frac{1}{2\hbar} \sum_{j=1,2} \left[\mu\omega\sigma_{q_j}^2 + \frac{1}{\mu\omega}\sigma_{p_j}^2 \right] - 1 \tag{A6}$$

which is precisely (73) in the local limit.

References

[1] G.H. Herzberg, Infrared and Raman Spectra of Polyatomic Molecules. (Krieger Publishing Company, 1991).
[2] M.E. Kellman. J. Chem. Phys. **93**, 6630 (1990).
[3] S. Califano, Vibrational States. (Wiley, New York. 1976).
[4] D.Papouek, and M.R.Aliev, Molecular Vibrational-Rotational Spectra. (Elsevier, Amsterdam, 1982).
[5] M.E. Kellman, Annu. Rev. Phys. Chem. **46**, 395 (1995).
[6] K.Yamanouchi, H.Yamada, and S. Tsuchiva, J.Chem.Phys. **88**, 4664 (1988).
[7] K.Yamanouchi, S.Takeuchi, and S.Tsuchiya, J.Chem.Phys. **92**, 4404 (1990).
[8] K.Yamanouchi, N.Ikeda, S.Tsuchiya, D.M.Jonas, J.K.Lundberg, G.W.Adamson, and R.W.Field, J.Chem.Phys. **95**, 6330 (1991).
[9] D.J.Nesbitt and R.W.Field, J.Phys.Chem. **100**, 12735 (1998).
[10] H.-L.Dai and and R.W.Field, Molecular Dynamics and Spectroscopy of Stimulated Emission Pumping. (World Scientic, Singapore,1995).
[11] R.J. Hayward, B.R. Henry and W.Siebrand, J.Mol.Spectrosc. **46**, (1973) 207.
[12] R.J. Hayward and B.R. Henry, *J.Mol.Spectrosc.* **50**, 58 (1974).
[13] R.J. Hayward and B.R. Henry, Chem.Phys. **12**, 387 (1976).
[14] M.Child and R.T.Lawton, Faraday Discuss. Chem. Soc. **71**, (1981) 273.
[15] M.S. Child and L. Halonen, Adv.Chem.Phys. **57**, 1 (1984).
[16] L.Halonen, Adv.Chem.Phys. **104**, (1998) 41.
[17] L. Halonen, Computational Molecular Spectroscopy. Edited by P.Jensen and P.R.Bunker. (John Wiley and Sons. 2000).
[18] P. Jensen, Mol.Phys. **98**, 1253 (2000).
[19] I.Mills and A.G.Robiette, Mol.Phys. **56**, 743 (1985).
[20] I.Mills and F.J.Mompean, Chem.Phys.Lett. **124**, 425 (1986).
[21] R.G.Della Valle, Mol.Phys. **63**, 611 (1988).
[22] K.K.Lehmann, Mol.Phys. **66**, 1129 (1989).
[23] M.M.Law and J.M.Duncan, Mol.Phys. **93**, 809 (1998).
[24] M.M.Law and J.M.Duncan, Mol.Phys. **93**, 821 (1998).
[25] A.Gambi and R.G.Della Valle, Mol.Phys. **105**, 1779 (2007).
[26] K.K.Lehmann, J.Chem.Phys. **79**, 1098 (1983).
[27] M.E.Kellman, J.Chem.Phys. **83**, 3843 (1985).
[28] L. Halonen and T. Carrington Jr. J. Chem. Phys. **88**, 4171 (1988).
[29] R. Lemus, Adv. in Phys. Chem. Vol.2011,(Article ID 593872, doi:1155/2011/593872).
[30] M.Bermúdez-Montaña, R.Lemus and O.Castaños, Europhysics Letters. (2016) In Press.
[31] M.C. Gutzwiller, Chaos in Classical and quantum mechanics. volume 1 of onterdisciplinary applied mathematics, 1990.
[32] E. Kennard, Zeitschrift für Physik. **44**, 326 (1927).
[33] P. Leach and S. Andriopoulos, Applicable Analysys and Discrete mathematics. **2**, 146 (2008).
[34] P.V.Ermakov, Applicable Analysys and Discrete mathematics. **2**, 123 (2008).
[35] A. Steen, over K.Dan. Vidensk. Selsk.Forh. **1** 1 (1984).
[36] R. Redheffer, Aequationes Mathematicae bf 58, 60 (1999).
[37] R. Redheffer and I. Redheffer , Aequationes Mathematicae bf 61, 131 (2001).
[38] H.R. Lewis Jr, Phys.Rev.Lett. **18**, 510 (1967).
[39] H.R. Lewis Jr and W.Riesenfeld, J.Math.Phys. **10**, 1458 (1969).
[40] I. Malkin, V. Man'ko and D.Trifonov, Phys.Rev. D. **2** 1371 (1970).
[41] I. Malkin, V. Man'ko and D.Trifonov,J. Math.Phys. **14**, 576 (1973).
[42] D. Schuch, J.Math.Phys. **48**, 122701 (2007).
[43] D. Schuch, *et al*, Sigma **4** 16 (2008).
[44] H.Cruz, D.Schuch, O.Castaños and O.Rosas-Ortiz, Ann. of Phys. **360**, 44 (2015).
[45] J. Guerrero and F.F.López-Ruis, Physica Scripta. **87**, 038105 (2013).
[46] F.F.López-Ruis and J. Guerrero, Journal of Physics: Conference Series (IOP Publishing, 2014). Vol. 538, pp.012015.
[47] J. Guerrero and F.F.López-Ruis, Physica Scripta. **90**, 074046 (2015).
[48] E.B. Wilson, Jr., J.C.Decious and P.C.Cross, Molecular Vibrations (Dover Publications, INC. New York. 1955).
[49] T.Matsushita and T.Terasaka, *Chem. Phys. Lett.* **100**, 138 (1983).
[50] O.Castaños, D. Schuch and O.Rosas-Ortiz, *Journal of Physics A.* **46** (2013). pp. 075304.
[51] W.-M Zhang, R.Gilmore, *et al*, Rev.Mod.Phys. **62**, 867 (1990).
[52] M. Sánchez-Castellanos, R.Lemus, M.Carvajal and F.Pérez-Bernal, Int.J.Quant.Chem. **112**,

3498 (2012).
[53] H. Vilanove and M. Jacon, Int. J. Quant. Chem. **55** 419 (1995).
[54] L. Christensen, N. Larsen, F. Nicolaisen, T. Pedersen, G. Srensen and H. Egsgaard, J. Mol.Spectrosc. **175** 220 (1996).
[55] R. Lemus, J.Mol.Spectrosc. **225**, 73 (2004).
[56] A.Messiah, Quantum Mechanics, (Dover, 1999).